

26



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,418	02/17/2000	Masumi Senoo	10992503-1	7752

22879 7590 01/10/2005

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY  
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION  
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 01/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/506,418	<b>Applicant(s)</b> SENOO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Stephen M Brinich	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12 and 14-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

Art Unit: 2624

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-12 & 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cavill in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art.

Re claims 1, 2, 6, & 8-9, Cavill discloses (Figures 4-5; column 3, line 58 - column 4, line 10; column 6, line 55 - column 7, line 8) a print job handling arrangement in which it is determined whether or not an entire print job can be processed locally. If the job cannot be processed locally (column 6, lines 37-54, particularly lines 39-45), the complex portions of the print job are sent to an external server for processing and processed results are received and combined with the locally processed portions.

Cavill discloses that the locally processing of the print job is performed by a local network computer (NC). Applicant's admitted Prior Art (page 1, line 23 - page 2, line 6) discloses a printer containing a processor capable of performing processing of print job data within the printer. Cavill discloses (column 3, lines 36-40) that the Cavill arrangement for sending complex portions of print jobs to an external server

Art Unit: 2624

may be used in any context where diversion of this task away from the local processor might be desirable. The use of the Cavill arrangement in this manner in conjunction with a printer with an internal print-job processor (i.e. the integration into a printer of a processor that performs the traffic-control functions of the Cavill local network computers) in order to enable the printer to perform print jobs that are beyond the internal processor's capability would be an expedient obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Re claims 3, 10, & 18, Cavill discloses (column 5, lines 38-39) the use of multiple external servers for processing complex portions of a print job.

Re claims 4-5, 11-12, & 15-18, Cavill discloses (column 5, lines 5-7) the use of an Internet connection (inherently including an interface to the device at each end of the connection) to access the external server.

Re claims 7 & 14, Cavill discloses (column 1, lines 37-52) the implementation of the print job handling arrangement in the form of a program stored in a memory and executable by a processor.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/3/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Art Unit: 2624

Re claim 1 (and dependent claims 2-7), claim 8 (and dependent claims 9-12 & 14), and claim 15 (and dependent claims 16-18), Applicant argues (8/3/04 Response: page 8, line 8 - page 9, line 3; page 10, line 11 - page 11, line 2; page 12, lines 1-16) that Cavill fails to disclose or suggest that the printer determines that portions of a print task cannot be rendered locally and sends those portions to an external rendering device in that situation.

As noted above, Cavill teaches (column 6, lines 37-54, particularly lines 39-45) a local network computer that performs the functions of determining which portions of a print task require complex remote processing and forwarding those portions to an external device. Applicant's Prior Art is relied upon as a teaching that it is known in the art to integrate a print rendering computer into a printing device, in support of the conclusion that it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to integrate into a printer a local print rendering computer that carries out the functions of the local network computers disclosed by Cavill.

Further re claim 1 (and dependent claims 2-7), claim 8 (and dependent claims 9-12 & 14), and claim 15 (and dependent claims 16-18), Applicant argues (8/3/04 Response: page 9, lines 4-26; page 11, lines 3-8; page 12, lines 17-21) that the Prior Art

Art Unit: 2624

described by Applicant does not disclose or suggest a determination of whether an entire print job can be processed by a printer or sending print jobs that cannot be processed by a printer to an external rendering device.

As noted above, the Cavill reference is relied upon for these disclosures. Applicant's Prior Art is relied upon as a teaching that it is known in the art to integrate a print rendering computer into a printing device.

Further re claim 1 (and dependent claims 2-7), claim 8 (and dependent claims 9-12 & 14), and claim 15 (and dependent claims 16-18), Applicant argues (8/3/04 Response: page 9, line 27 - page 10, line 5; page 11, lines 9-17; page 12, line 22 - page 13, line 2) that the combination of Cavill and Applicant's disclosed Prior Art fails to disclose or suggest a printer that sends a print job to an external rendering device if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer and also fails to disclose or suggest that a printer may determine whether an entire print job can be processed.

However, the combination of references described in the outstanding 35 USC §103 rejection is based upon the teaching (from Applicant's disclosed Prior Art) that it is known in the art to integrate a local print rendering computer into a printer, and the conclusion that it would be obvious to one of

Art Unit: 2624

ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the functions of the Cavill local network computers into such a local print rendering computer integrated into a printer. This combination clearly incorporates *into a printer* the functions of sending a print job to an external rendering device if the entire print job cannot be processed by the printer and determining whether an entire print job can be processed. Applicant's argument does not appear to directly address the reasoning offered in support of this combination of references, but rather alleges that the combination fails to teach or suggest these elements.

#### **Conclusion**

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2624

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 703-305-4390. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 703-306-0377.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 703-308-7452.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

Stephen M Brinich  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

smb   
December 20, 2004



THOMAS D  
~~LEE~~ LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER